

- 1 -

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of:	:	Before the Examiner:
Bierbrauer et al.	:	Parthasarathy, Pramila
Serial No.: 10/015,301	:	Group Art Unit: 2136
Filed: December 12, 2001	:	
Title: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR	:	IBM Corporation
AUTOMIZED AND SYNCHRONOUS	:	Dept. T81/Bldg. 503
EXECUTION OF CUSTOMIZED CODE	:	P.O. Box 12915
ON OFF-LOADED RETRIEVED	:	3039 Cornwallis Road
DOCUMENTS IN A DATA PROCESSING	:	Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
SYSTEM	:	

SECOND APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is International Business Machines, Inc., which is the assignee of the entire right, title and interest in the above-identified patent application.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals or interferences known to Appellants, Appellants' legal representative or assignee which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-7 are pending in the Application. Claims 1-7 stand rejected. Claims 1-7 are appealed.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Appellants have not submitted any amendments following receipt of the final rejection with a mailing date of May 26, 2006.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent Claim 1:

In one embodiment of the present invention, a method for processing documents being off-loaded in a document processing system in which requests are executed by an off-loading process, the method comprising the step of providing customized code for execution during the off-loading process. Specification, page 4, lines 2-14. The method may further comprise invoking the customized code when an off-loading request is issued relative to a document in the document processing system synchronously to the off-loading process. Specification, page 4, lines 2-14; Figure 1, steps 104, 106.

Independent Claim 6:

In one embodiment of the present invention, a method for executing an agent comprising customized code relative to documents being archived from a document processing system, the method comprising the step of selecting a document resident in the document processing system for archiving. Specification, page 4, lines 15-26; Figure 2, step 201. The method may further comprise creating an archiving request for the selected document to an archiving engine associated with the document processing system. Specification, page 4, lines 15-26; Figure 2, step 202. The method may further comprise invoking a pre-archiving agent, if any, on the selected document. Specification, page 4, lines 15-26; Figure 2, step 203. The method may further comprise that when the pre-archiving agent is finished, archiving the selected document. Specification, page 5, lines 1-7; Figure 2, step 206. The method may further comprise invoking a post-archiving agent, if any, on the archived document.

Specification, page 5, lines 1-7; Figure 2, step 206. The method may further comprise that when the post-archiving agent is finished, marking the archived document as 'archived'. Specification, page 5, lines 1-7; Figure 2, step 210.

Independent Claim 7:

In one embodiment of the present invention, in a computing environment, a system for processing documents being off-loaded in a document processing system in which requests are executed by an off-loading process, the system comprises means for providing customized code for execution during the off-loading process. Specification, page 4, lines 2-14. The system may further comprise means for invoking the customized code when an off-loading request is issued relative to a document in the document processing system synchronously to the off-loading process. Specification, page 4, lines 2-14; Figure 1, steps 104, 106.

VI. GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A. Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Martin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,178) (hereinafter "Martin").

B. Claims 1-5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin.

VII. ARGUMENT

A. Claim 6 is not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

The Examiner has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Martin. Office Action (5/26/2006), page 7. Appellants respectfully traverse for at least the reasons stated below.

For a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102, each and every claim limitation must be found within the cited prior art reference and arranged as required by the claim. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Appellants respectfully assert that Martin does not disclose "creating an archiving request for the selected document to an archiving engine associated with the document processing system" as recited in claim 6. The Examiner cites column 17, line 43 – column 18, line 30 of Martin as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (5/26/2006), page 7. Appellants respectfully traverse.

Martin instead discloses that during execution of the load job, the EDM system determines the registered bulk move requirements and uses the same load job to provide the data for the bulk move operation. Column 17, lines 47-50. Martin further discloses that this results in a one pass of source data, i.e., a single load of source data from the source database to accomplish multiple tasks. Column 17, lines 50-52. Additionally, Martin discloses that the EDM program creates a change record comprising the captured change data and preferably stores the change record in an EDM log. Column 18, lines 18-20. Furthermore, Martin discloses that the EDM process intercepts the changes made to the database, creates change records, and stores the change records to the EDM log. Column 18, lines 26-28. Hence, Martin discloses loading data from a source database (DB2 database), transforming the data from the source database to the format of the target database (Oracle), and then moving the transformed data to the target database (Oracle) as illustrated in Figures 13 and 14 of Martin.

There is no language in the cited passage that teaches creating an archive request. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that teaches creating an archive request for a selected document. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that teaches creating an archive request for a selected document to an archiving engine. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that teaches

creating an archive request for a selected document to an archiving engine associated with a document processing system. Thus, Martin does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 6, and thus Martin does not anticipate claim 6. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Appellants further assert that Martin does not disclose "invoking a pre-archiving agent, if any, on the selected document" as recited in claim 6. The Examiner cites column 18, line 31 – column 19, line 49 of Martin as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (5/26/2006), page 7. Appellants respectfully traverse and assert that Martin instead discloses that the EDM program initiates a data movement operation to one or more target computer systems. Column 18, lines 31-32. Martin further discloses that the EDM program transforms the captured change data to a new format for various ones of the target databases. Column 18, lines 36-38. Additionally, Martin discloses that once the changed data has been physically captured with the specific ECCR routines, the data is transferred to the change interface component (CIC) comprising the common set of routines. Column 19, lines 16-19. Hence, Martin discloses transforming the captured data from the source database to the format of the target database, and then moving the transformed data to the target database. There is no language in the cited passage that discloses invoking a pre-archiving agent. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses invoking a pre-archiving agent, if any, on the selected document. Thus, Martin does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 6, and thus Martin does not anticipate claim 6. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Appellants further assert that Martin does not disclose "when the pre-archiving agent is finished, archiving the selected document" as recited in claim 6. The Examiner cites column 18, line 31 – column 19, line 49 of Martin as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (5/26/2006), page 7. Appellants respectfully traverse. As stated above, Martin instead discloses that the EDM program initiates a data movement operation to one or more target computer systems. Column 18, lines 31-32. Martin further discloses that the EDM program transforms

the captured change data to a new format for various ones of the target databases. Column 18, lines 36-38. Additionally, Martin discloses that once the changed data has been physically captured with the specific ECCR routines, the data is transferred to the change interface component (CIC) comprising the common set of routines. Column 19, lines 16-19. Hence, Martin discloses transforming the captured data from the source database to the format of the target database, and then moving the transformed data to the target database. There is no language in the cited passage that discloses that when the pre-archiving agent is finished, the selected document is archived. Thus, Martin does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 6, and thus Martin does not anticipate claim 6. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Appellants further assert that Martin does not disclose "invoking a post-archiving agent, if any, on the archived document" as recited in claim 6. The Examiner cites column 17, line 43 – column 19, line 49 of Martin as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (5/26/2006), page 7. Appellants respectfully traverse. As stated above, Martin instead discloses transforming the captured data from the source database to the format of the target database, and then moving the transformed data to the target database. There is no language in the cited passage that discloses invoking a post-archiving agent. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses invoking a post-archiving agent, if any, on the archived document. Thus, Martin does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 6, and thus Martin does not anticipate claim 6. M.P.E.P. §2131

Appellants further assert that Martin does not disclose "when the post-archiving agent is finished, marking the archived document as 'archived'" as recited in claim 6. The Examiner cites column 18, line 31 – column 19, line 49 of Martin as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (5/26/2006), page 7. Appellants respectfully traverse. As stated above, Martin instead discloses that the EDM program initiates a data movement operation to one or more target computer systems. Column 18, lines 31-32. Martin further discloses that the EDM program transforms the captured change data to a new format for various ones of the target

databases. Column 18, lines 36-38. Additionally, Martin discloses that once the changed data has been physically captured with the specific ECCR routines, the data is transferred to the change interface component (CIC) comprising the common set of routines. Column 19, lines 16-19. Hence, Martin discloses transforming the captured data from the source database to the format of the target database, and then moving the transformed data to the target database. There is no language in the cited passage that discloses that when the post-archiving agent is finished, the archived document is marked as archived. Thus, Martin does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 6, and thus Martin does not anticipate claim 6. M.P.E.P. §2131

B. Claims 1-5 and 7 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin. Office Action (5/26/2006), page 2. Appellants respectfully traverse for at least the reasons stated below.

1. Martin does not teach or suggest the following claim limitations.

a. Claims 1 and 7 are patentable over Martin.

Appellants respectfully assert that Martin does not teach or suggest "providing customized code for execution during the off-loading process" as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claim 7. As understood by Appellants, the Examiner cites column 17, line 43 – column 19, line 49 of Martin as teaching the above-cited claim limitation excluding the aspect of having the code "customized." Office Action (5/26/2006), pages 3-5. Appellants respectfully traverse. As stated above, Martin instead teaches transforming the captured data from the source database to the format of the target database, and then moving the transformed data to the target database. There is no language in the cited passage that teaches providing code for execution during the off-loading process. Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claims 1 and 7, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect,

factual predicates in support of the rejection. *In re Rouffet*, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453, 1455 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

Further, the Examiner states:

Martin discloses a Enterprise data movement (EDM) system wherein during the execution of a load and data movement (off-load) operations are carried out at the same time (synchronously). EDM creates an archive of the changed record and logs these changes as change records to the EDM log. EDM provides process to intercept changes as they are made to the database log and logs the changes in EDM log. An environmental change capture routine (ECCR) provides the changed data to one or more logs and an archive log at the same time a read task routine is invoked when the target requests to be updated. If a request begins on the archive log, the read task processes all archive logs. Martin further discloses that these routines are preferably configured as plug-ins (customized code) to the interface component and are responsible for actually capturing the changed data, at the same time these ECCR routines are easily incorporated into the common code. Office Action (5/26/2006), page 3.

Appellants respectfully traverse the assertion that Martin allegedly teaches loading data from a source database and then transforming that data to the format of the target database, and then moving the transformed data to the target database all synchronously. There is no language in the cited passage to support such an assertion.

Further, Appellants respectfully traverse the assertion that Martin teaches that the "ECCR provides the changed data to one or more logs and an archive log at the same time a read task routine is invoked when the target requests to be updated." Appellants have not identified any language in the cited passage to support such a statement.

Further, Appellants respectfully traverse the assertion that "plug-ins" as used in Martin may be interpreted as customized code as recited in claims 1 and 7.

The Examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to support the Examiner's interpretations mentioned above. *Ex parte Levy*, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990). That is, the Examiner must provide extrinsic evidence that must make clear that Martin teaches the assertions made by the Examiner, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Since the Examiner has not provided any such objective evidence, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness for rejecting claims 1 and 7. M.P.E.P. §2143.

Appellants further assert that Martin does not teach or suggest "invoking the customized code when an off-loading request is issued relative to a document in the document processing system synchronously to the off-loading process" as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claim 7. As understood by Appellants, the Examiner cites column 17, line 43 – column 19, line 49 of Martin as teaching the above-cited claim limitation excluding the aspect of having the code "customized." Office Action (5/26/2006), pages 3-5. Appellants respectfully traverse. As stated above, Martin instead teaches transforming the captured data from the source database to the format of the target database, and then moving the transformed data to the target database. There is no language in the cited passage that teaches invoking code when an off-loading request is issued. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that teaches invoking code when an off-loading request is issued relative to a document in the document processing system. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that teaches invoking code when an off-loading request is issued relative to a document in the document processing system synchronously to the off-loading process. Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claims 1 and 7, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. *In re Rouffet*, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453, 1455 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

- b. Claims 2-5 are patentable over Martin for at least the reasons that claim 1 is patentable.

Claims 2-5 each recite combinations of features of independent claim 1, and thus claims 2-5 are patentable over Martin for at least the reasons that claim 1 is patentable over Martin.

- c. Claim 2 is patentable over Martin.

Appellants respectfully assert that Martin does not teach or suggest "wherein the customized code is invoked synchronously to process the document before the document has been off-loaded from the document processing system" as recited in claim 2. The Examiner cites column 17, lines 43-58 of Martin as teaching the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (5/26/2006), page 5. Appellants respectfully traverse and assert that Martin instead teaches that during execution of a load job, the EDM system determines the registered bulk move requirements and use the same load job to provide the data for the bulk move operation. Column 17, lines 47-50. Martin further teaches that if a DBMS includes a pre-scheduled load job for a weekly reorganization, the bulk data move operation can take advantage of this load job for the load operation of the bulk data move operation at the same time. Column 17, lines 55-58. There is no language in the cited passage that teaches invoking customized code synchronously. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that teaches invoking customized code synchronously to process the document before the document has been off-loaded. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that teaches invoking customized code synchronously to process the document before the document has been off-loaded from the document processing system. Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 2, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. *In re Rouffet*, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453, 1455 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

d. Claim 3 is patentable over Martin.

Appellants respectfully assert that Martin does not teach or suggest "wherein the customized code is invoked synchronously to process the document after the document has been off-loaded from the document processing system" as recited in claim 3. The Examiner cites column 18, lines 31-58 of Martin as teaching the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (5/26/2006), page 6. Appellants respectfully traverse and assert that Martin instead teaches that the EDM program initiates a data movement operation to one or more target computer systems. Column 18, lines 31-32. Martin further teaches that the EDM program transforms the captured change data to a new format for various ones of the target databases. Column 18, lines 36-38. There is no language in the cited passage that teaches invoking customized code synchronously. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that teaches invoking customized code synchronously to process the document after the document has been off-loaded. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that teaches invoking customized code synchronously to process the document after the document has been off-loaded from the document processing system. Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 3, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. *In re Rouffet*, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453, 1455 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

e. Claim 4 is patentable over Martin.

Appellants respectfully assert that Martin does not teach or suggest "wherein the customized code forms an agent, the agent being invoked via a plug-in interface to the document processing system" as recited in claim 4. The Examiner cites column 18, line 61 – column 19, line 3 of Martin as teaching the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (5/26/2006), page 6. Appellants respectfully traverse and assert that Martin instead teaches that the ECCR routine comprises specific ECCR routines which are specific to the respective source database and a change interface

component which comprises code that is common for all of the various source databases or capture environments. Column 18, lines 61-65. There is no language in the cited passage that teaches a customized code forming an agent. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that teaches a customized code forming an agent, the agent being invoked via a plug-in interface to the document processing system. Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 4, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. *In re Rouffet*, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453, 1455 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

f. Claim 5 is patentable over Martin.

Appellants respectfully assert that Martin does not teach or suggest "wherein the customized code runs inside a plug-in architecture" as recited in claim 5. The Examiner cites column 18, line 61 – column 19, line 3 of Martin as teaching the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (5/26/2006), page 6. Appellants respectfully traverse. As stated above, Martin instead teaches that the ECCR routine comprises specific ECCR routines which are specific to the respective source database and a change interface component which comprises code that is common for all of the various source databases or capture environments. Column 18, lines 61-65. There is no language in the cited passage that teaches a customized code running inside a plug-in architecture. Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 5, since the Examiner is relying upon incorrect, factual predicates in support of the rejection. *In re Rouffet*, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453, 1455 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

2. Examiner's motivation is insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claims 1 and 7.

Most if not all inventions arise from a combination of old elements. See *In re Rouffet*, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453, 1457 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Obviousness is determined from the vantage point of a hypothetical person having ordinary skill in the art to which the patent pertains. *In re Rouffet*, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453, 1457 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Therefore,

an Examiner may often find every element of a claimed invention in the prior art. *Id.* However, identification in the prior art of each individual part claimed is insufficient to defeat patentability of the whole claimed invention. *See Id.* In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the elements from the cited prior art references for combination in the manner claimed. *In re Rouffet*, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453, 1458 (Fed. Cir. 1998). That is, the Examiner must provide some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves, the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or, in some case, the nature of the problem to be solved, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. *See In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 999, 50 U.S.P.Q.2d 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Whether the Examiner relies on an express or an implicit showing, the Examiner must provide particular findings related thereto. *In re Kotzab*, 55 U.S.P.Q.2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

As understood by Appellants, the Examiner admits that the aspect of a "customized code" as recited in claims 1 and 7 is not taught in Martin. Office Action (5/26/2006), pages 3-5. The Examiner modifies Martin to include this missing aspect "for providing dynamic (synchronous) approach to off-loading." Office Action (5/26/2006), pages 4 and 5. The Examiner appears to be focusing on column 3, lines 51-52 of Martin as support for the Examiner's motivation. Office Action (5/26/2006), pages 3-5. The Examiner's motivation is insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claims 1 and 7.

As stated above, the Examiner's support for making such a modification appears to be taken from column 3, lines 51-52 of Martin. Office Action (5/26/2006), pages 3-5. However, the Examiner is ignoring the remaining language in the passage. Martin teaches that such customized routines require that programmers have extensive knowledge of how the business works, since each move and transformation must coincide with business objectives and processes. Column 3, lines 59-62. Martin

further teaches that because these routines are usually specific to a source or target database, they are difficult to port to other environments. Column 3, lines 62-64. Additionally, Martin teaches that these routines are also difficult to repeat because the routines are unique to each situation and because there is no infrastructure in place to manage the processes. Column 3, lines 64-67. Furthermore, Martin teaches that building custom routines robs in-house DBAs of time better spent on their core jobs: database design, maintenance and optimization. Column 3, line 67-column 4, line 2. As a result, it is clearly evident that Martin teaches away from using customized code. There is no language in Martin that supports the Examiner's motivation of using customized code for off-loading. As a result, the Examiner does not provide reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would modify Martin to include the missing claim limitations of claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness for rejecting claims 1-5 and 7. *In re Rouffet*, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453, 1458 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

Further, Martin addresses the problem of ensuring that any changes made to one database are propagated to the other databases in the system so that common data remains constant. Column 4, lines 54-57. The Examiner has not provided any reasons as to why one skilled in the art would modify Martin, which teaches ensuring that any changes made to one database are propagated to the other databases in the system so that common data remains constant, to include the aspect of customizing code in connection with the off-loading process (Examiner admits that Martin does not teach this limitation). The Examiner's motivation ("for providing dynamic (synchronous) approach to off-loading") does not provide such reasoning. Further, the Examiner has not explained how providing a dynamic approach to off-loading (Examiner's motivation) relates to using customized code in connection with the off-loading process. Hence, the Examiner's motivation does not provide reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would modify Martin to include the aspect of

customizing code in connection with the off-loading process as recited in claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness for rejecting claims 1-5 and 7. *In re Rouffet*, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453, 1458 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

3. Proposed modification to Martin renders the invention of Martin unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

As stated above, the Examiner proposes to modify Martin by including the aspect of "customized code" as recited in claims 1 and 7. The Examiner's support for making such a modification appears to be taken from column 3, lines 51-52 of Martin. Office Action (5/26/2006), pages 3-5. However, the Examiner is ignoring the remaining language in the passage. As stated above, Martin teaches that such customized routines require that programmers have extensive knowledge of how the business works, since each move and transformation must coincide with business objectives and processes. Column 3, lines 59-62. Martin further teaches that because these routines are usually specific to a source or target database, they are difficult to port to other environments. Column 3, lines 62-64. Additionally, Martin teaches that these routines are also difficult to repeat because the routines are unique to each situation and because there is no infrastructure in place to manage the processes. Column 3, lines 64-67. Furthermore, Martin teaches that building custom routines robs in-house DBAs of time better spent on their core jobs: database design, maintenance and optimization. Column 3, line 67-column 4, line 2. As a result, it is clearly evident that Martin teaches away from using customized code. Consequently, the proposed modification would render the invention of Martin being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purposes. As a result, there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 U.S.P.Q. 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Accordingly, the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claims 1-5 and 7. M.P.E.P. §2143.

VIII. CONCLUSION

For the reasons noted above, the rejections of claims 1-7 are in error. Appellants respectfully request reversal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-7.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.

Attorneys for Appellants

By: _____

Robert A. Voigt, Jr.

Reg. No. 47,159

Kelly K. Kordzik

Reg. No. 36,571

P.O. Box 50784
Dallas, Texas 75201
(512) 370-2832

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A method for processing documents being off-loaded in a document processing system in which requests are executed by an off-loading process, said method comprising the steps of:

providing customized code for execution during the off-loading process; and
invoking the customized code when an off-loading request is issued relative to a document in the document processing system synchronously to the off-loading process.

2. The method according to claim 1, wherein the customized code is invoked synchronously to process the document before the document has been off-loaded from the document processing system.

3. The method according to claim 1, wherein the customized code is invoked synchronously to process the document after the document has been off-loaded from the document processing system.

4. The method according to claim 1, wherein the customized code forms an agent, the agent being invoked via a plug-in interface to the document processing system.

5. The method according to claim 1, wherein the customized code runs inside a plug-in architecture.

6. A method for executing an agent comprising customized code relative to documents being archived from a document processing system, said method comprising the steps of:

selecting a document resident in the document processing system for archiving;

creating an archiving request for the selected document to an archiving engine associated with the document processing system;

invoking a pre-archiving agent, if any, on the selected document;

when the pre-archiving agent is finished, archiving the selected document;

invoking a post-archiving agent, if any, on the archived document; and

when the post-archiving agent is finished, marking the archived document as 'archived'.

7. In a computing environment, a system for processing documents being off-loaded in a document processing system in which requests are executed by an off-loading process, said system comprising:

means for providing customized code for execution during the off-loading process; and

means for invoking the customized code when an off-loading request is issued relative to a document in the document processing system synchronously to the off-loading process.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence was submitted pursuant to §§1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 of 37 C.F.R. or of any other evidence entered by the Examiner and relied upon by Appellants in the Appeal.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no related proceedings to the current proceeding.

Austin_1 319921v.1